

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 and 54-61 were pending as of the Office Action mailed February 20, 2009. Claims 1, 54, and 61 are in independent form. Claims 1, 54, and 61 are being amended. No claims are being cancelled. Claims 62-65 were newly added in a response filed April 3, 2009. Claim 66 has been newly added in this supplemental response. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments to the claims can be found within the applicant's specification at least at page 1, lines 11-19; page 2, lines 9-14; page 3, lines 2-14; page 5, lines 13-14; and page 7, line 7 through page 9, line 5. Support for the new claims can be found within the applicant's specification at least at page 6, line 30 through page 7, line 4.

Reconsideration and reexamination of the application is respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Interview Summary

The applicant thanks Examiner Darno for the courtesy of the in-person interview on April 24, 2009. The time spent with the applicant's representative Arrienne M. Lezak was greatly appreciated. During the interview, the applicant's representatives further explained the format-independent nature of the messages. Recommendations were made by the examiner for overcoming the prior art. These recommendation have been incorporated into the claims as noted above.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 1-14, 16, 17, and 54-61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,980,817 ("Chow") in view of U.S. Patent Appl. No. 2003/0065738 ("Yang"), in further view of U.S. Patent Appl. No. 2004/0087300 ("Lewis").

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the combined teachings of Chow, Yang, and Lewis, and in further view of U.S. Patent Appl. No. 2004/0058652 ("McGregor").

Claim 1

To expedite prosecution, and in accordance with the examiner's recommendations, claim 1 has been amended to recite provisioning events including activation of a service, deactivation

of a service, suspension of a service, resumption of a service, modification of a service profile or service parameters, and gathering of status information associated with a service; and the provisioning request message being a format-independent electronic message capable of being constructed by and interpreted by any external system, the provisioning request message having a data structure that includes a provisioning reply.

The applicant respectfully submits that the teachings of Chow, Yang, Lewis, and McGregor, alone or in combination, do not teach or disclose the limitations recited in claim 1, as amended. Thus, the applicant further submits that claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Claim 54 recites features corresponding to those of claim 1 and stands rejected for the same reasons. Therefore, claim 54 is allowable for the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 61

To expedite prosecution, and in accordance with the examiner's recommendations, claim 61 has been amended to recite receiving at a provisioning system, a provisioning request message generated by an external system, wherein the provisioning request message is a format-independent electronic message capable of being constructed and interpreted by any external system, wherein the provisioning request message is capable of specifying a request to provision entities on multiple systems using multiple schemes for identifying an entity, and wherein the provisioning request message identifies an entity and includes a provisioning reply and one or more performable actions.

The applicant respectfully submits that the teachings of Chow, Yang, Lewis, and McGregor, alone or in combination, do not teach or disclose the limitations recited in claim 61, as amended. Thus, the applicant further submits that claim 61 is in condition for allowance.

Remaining Claims

Claims 2-17, 55-60, and 62-65, depend from independent claims 1 and 54 and are allowable for at least the reasons that apply to those independent claims.

Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is therefore respectfully requested.

New Claims 66

Support for new claim 66 is noted above. The applicant respectfully submits that the teachings of Chow, Yang, Lewis, and McGregor, alone or in combination, do not teach or disclose the limitations recited in claim 66. Thus, the applicant submits that claim 66 is allowable.

Conclusion

The applicant respectfully requests that all pending claims be allowed.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's selecting some particular arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist. Finally, the applicant's decision to amend or cancel any claim should not be understood as implying that the applicant agrees with any positions taken by the examiner with respect to that claim or other claims.

Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 50-1432, (555255-012441).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 15, 2009

By: /Arrienne M. Lezak/
Arrienne M. Lezak (Reg. No. 51,943)
Jones Day
1755 Embarcadero Road
Palo Alto, CA 94303
(650)-687-4163